

Email Helen Shervington 250924

Dear Helen,

I hope this email finds you well.

Thank you for your response dated 12 September and for acknowledging the concerns raised. In the spirit of constructive dialogue, I accept your apologies and appreciate your efforts to improve communication again. However, I must express my continued disappointment with the persistent inconsistency and lack of transparency from Birmingham City Council. Over the past year, communication has been erratic at best, leaving residents in a perpetual state of frustration and distrust. Despite numerous reassurances, we have repeatedly been let down.

A critical issue remains regarding the inclusion of high-quality and recently built homes, both council-built and non-council-built, within the regeneration zone. To our knowledge, no other regeneration project in the UK has ever negatively impacted privately owned, non-council-built freehold properties in this way. This is an unprecedented and extraordinary aspect of the Ladywood Regeneration, which the Council has yet to address. Freehold owners of these well-maintained, non-council-built properties continue to be neglected, disregarded, and overlooked. Housing-led regeneration typically focuses on older or council-built homes, and the lack of support for private freehold homeowners reflects the absence of a precedent for such a situation.

It is concerning that your recent email continues to skirt around addressing BCC's failure to specifically inform residents of privately owned, non-council-built properties in 2019. The only official regeneration communication sent to residents in 2019 was a series of leaflets, bearing the council's coat of arms, which detailed the affected streets. At no point was it made clear that private homeowners in non-council-built properties would be impacted. To now claim that "the omission in the documents provided was unintentional" is both disingenuous and insulting, further antagonising residents.

Additionally, your characterisation of my concerns as "perceived ambiguity" is perplexing. There was no ambiguity. Let's revisit the Regeneration Ladywood Newsletter from June 2019 (attached), part of a series of Council-branded communications distributed over six months to Central Ladywood residents:

- **Paragraph 1** mentions "Council-built homes."
- **Paragraph 2** refers to homes "in need of improvement," yet my estate is relatively new and in excellent condition.
- **Paragraph 3** outlines the "Five Streets," with no mention of private, non-council-built freehold homes, which we now know are affected by the red-line area.
- **Paragraph 4** explicitly calls on "Council tenants and owner-occupiers in the eight Council-built areas of Central Ladywood" to join the Steering Group, with no reference to non-council-built private freehold homeowners.

Please provide specific details from this leaflet or any other council-branded leaflet from 2019 that indicate any risk to high-quality private homes or the inclusion of the three private, non-council-built freehold estates in the regeneration plans. Personally, I find this deeply frustrating. In 2019, I was in full-time employment, and had I been informed that my home might be at risk, I could have made more informed decisions about my future. Residents of the private freehold estates were denied the opportunity to assess the situation based on real risks. Is this fair or just? It was not until four years

later, that residents of the private, non-council built freehold estates discovered, by reading the Birmingham Mail and then the June 2023 Cabinet Report, that their homes might be jeopardised — a report that mentioned CPOs no less than 26 times!

You mentioned that you cannot respond on behalf of the political representatives. However, it is notable that on the same day you sent your response (12 September), members of Ladywood Unite happened to meet with Cllr Bore, who indicated that he assisted you in drafting your correspondence that day due to your lack of understanding of the project and that you frequently rely on his expertise. This inconsistency between departments and representatives only deepens the sense of disillusionment among residents.

Moreover, while you state that ward councillors "regularly raise concerns and challenges on behalf of their constituents," this does not align with the experience of residents with regard to the regeneration project. We have repeatedly asked — and at times even pleaded — for our councillors to raise concerns on our behalf, but this has not materialised. Following your email, we asked residents to share any positive experiences or support from our councillors on this matter, but not a single response was received. Additionally, a review of Council meeting minutes and video clips show no evidence of our councillors raising concerns from residents about the Ladywood Regeneration Project. This is deeply concerning.

Therefore, I request that you provide verifiable evidence that our councillors have raised concerns on behalf of residents specifically related to this project. Transparency and accountability are crucial, and without this evidence, it becomes increasingly difficult for residents to trust the Council's claims or intentions.

In conclusion, we request the following:

- A formal acknowledgment that residents of privately owned, non-council-built freehold properties were not informed about the regeneration plans in the Council-branded leaflets from 2019.
- Concrete evidence demonstrating how our ward councillors have raised concerns regarding the Ladywood Regeneration Project on behalf of their constituents.
- A clear and consistent communication plan that directly addresses the concerns of residents in good-quality and new homes.

I look forward to your prompt response and trust that these serious concerns will now be addressed with the urgency and gravity they deserve.

Best wishes

George

Also on behalf of Ladywood Unite
Ladywood Unite Volunteer

www.ladywoodunite.com